



Task Force on Teacher Leadership and Compensation Meeting Notes

September 28, 2012
10:00 a.m. – 2:00 p.m.
Forest Spaulding Conference Room 310
Ola Babcock Miller Building
1112 East Grand Avenue
Des Moines, Iowa

MEMBERS PRESENT:

In person: Teresa Bellinghauser, Connie Boesen, Mary Jane Cobb, Mike Cormack, Jason Glass, Jessica Gogerty, Kent Henning, Isaiah McGee, Diane Pratt, Dan Smith, Ryan Wise, Denny Wulf,
Phone: Jodie Graham, Angie Jandrey, Ann Lebo, Carl Smith

OPENING:

Ryan: Purpose is to clean up recommendations and to say what we need to say in the best way possible.
A.M. – We will go over recommendation by recommendation- already pulled out comments.
P.M. – We will work on Overview, Introduction and conclusion
Prepared cheat sheet for discussion today.
2, 4, 11, still need fist to five – will be done electronically
Recommendation 4 includes recommendation on face salary.
All other recommendations – is this the clearest, most effective way to say recommendation.
All include corrections from last Friday.

AGENDA ITEM: 10:00 – 2:00 p.m. Review the Recommendations:

Recommendation 1: Create and fund multiple, meaningful and well-designed Career Pathway opportunities open to all teachers in Iowa.

One of most significant in terms of amount of space. 5 issues were raised in online comments.
Do we want to expand language to open to all teachers and those considering careers in education? Might create more questions than it solves. Ryan- already have consensus so unless someone is passionate, keep as is.
Jason suggests adding on page 8, in an overview, this point could be added there. (more promising salary and a variety of enhanced career pathway opportunities).

Ryan will send out on Monday a document that tracks changes from today.

Don't need to address second bullet point – third year for initial teacher.

Bullet point 3: Career teachers as mentors without being on official mentor pathway?

Discussion about pros and cons, differentiated paths, and teachers would receive time and money to do mentoring.
New model would provide more time for mentor to get to the classroom. Add something about mentor teachers working with student teachers, p. 14?
Mentor teacher might be able to mentor student teacher on regular basis, but model teacher is actual cooperating teacher for student teacher. Agreement that student teacher reference does not require separate bullet.

Bullet point 4: Recommend regular meeting with initial teachers.

Set thresholds with meeting, meet time at least bi-weekly

Bullet point 5: Where do we address National Board Certification? How do we call it out?

Mary Jane: Maybe in appendices in back. Maybe a statement there. Page 31. Career Pathways Compensation Program. Not requiring it for any of these positions, but don't want to lose sight of it.
Jason: Supports language mentioned by Mary Jane, also add board certification status could be used in process for selecting teachers for various roles.
Mike: Term could provide special consideration for roles.

Mary Jane: Teachers with national board shall continue to be compensated by the state, and should be given special consideration for teacher pathway roles.

Jason: Recommends lead teacher teaching maximum of 50% of time, instead of 30%.

Mary Jane: District could take this model and adapt it. Initial teacher, year 2: Could we eliminate what is in parenthesis?

Ryan: Any other issues in long form, not on cheat sheet?

Online comments – Do we feel every National Board teacher is a good leader?

Landing on that National Board teachers get special consideration.

Peer review leads to employment positions? Mentor teacher duties and responsibilities, third bullet. Strike bullet?

Could have participate in peer review process.

Annual evaluation of lead teacher, decided to take out annual evaluation and edit accordingly. "Participate in peer review process", striking anything after that.

Recommendation 2: Establish a pathway that utilizes the wisdom and expertise of educators who are not currently practicing.

Folks generally landing on 4 or 5 with online comments. Do we need to change language or is it sufficiently clear.?

Need to be clear that this will not be ongoing source of center of expertise.

Quick fist to five has consensus on teacher emeritus. All are 3 or higher.

Recommendation 3: Review existing allocations and use these funds strategically to enhance teacher compensaton and create leadership opportunities.

Ryan: Two comments made on number three. This had most lengthy, intense discussion last time. We did land on place with consensus. Will call out Mike's and Julie's comments, but do not need to reopen to big conversation, but reopening for any other comments regarding graduate credit issues.

Mary Jane: Julie's comments may get to later bullet point. Julie and folks are in real world dealing with this now, cuts to budget.

Jessica: Is Julie's concern about teachers in the middle of getting Master's degree, that will face compensation changes in the middle of their degree program?

Mary Jane: Will be subject to local district decision. Will hope local districts will grandfather participants in.

Ryan: What Mary Jane said is implicitly understood regarding preapproved pay increase that teacher had previously negotiated.

Jason: Assuming at local bargaining table it is implicit.

Denny: Should we make guidance or emphasis in document about this?'

Mary Jane: Page 17, maybe a good place to add guidance..

Carl: Would be good reminder, though obvious reminder.

Ryan: Separate bullet or within bullet?

Jessica: Sometimes districts will obey letter of law and defy its intent. Add as cautionary note?

Carl: Could comment be added in lead in?

Ryan: Agreed in room to add language from Carl. Any further points for discussion?

Dan: Be as clear and as transparent as possible about the funding assumptions. District will have to deal with issues of providing instructions in classrooms as we deal with Master, Mentor teachers. If assumptions aren't clear, will have real disagreements about whether this proposal is doable. Assumptions that school districts will have to assume. Districts will have to figure out how to pay for it. Potential for misunderstanding is very great if we are not clear. Not sure where or when the funding will be discussed.

Ryan: We do call out this point in number 8. If it's not funded, we the Task Force cannot be on board. The financial burden on districts will be too much.

Kent: What I heard in Dan's comments, are what are primary drivers for need of additional dollars, call it out for legislators has benefits.

Denny: Concerns for class size increase as funding source.

Jason: Responding re modeling side: All major levers and assumptions in model have surfaced. Market factors, teacher compensation, etc. Can calculate cost, how much new money can pour into situation, time frame -- difference between the two, reallocation.

Dan: I'm not sure those factors are understood. I am not aware of where those in field can go to examine the assumptions involved. Total cost and as this goes forward, what is funded by additional funding. 100 to 200 million dollars needed from additional sources? Where did that figure come from? Assumptions re additional costs and where that money is going to come from?

Jason: It would not be clear from the work this Task Force has done. The financial modeling not charged with that. Multi step process. In general, outlined in this document where money should come from. Next step is to bring recommendations to legislation for financial modeling. Multiple steps ahead where more detailed models will come forward.

Diane: May not affect just class size but also number of sections taught. Might be that we just cannot offer certain courses, eliminating something that districts offer.

Jason: May involve different configuration. Is it scalable? Yes, the model is scalable.

Mike: Details need to be in, but road map has to be established by October 15th. Trying to find common goal, then imperative as department to provide details.

Dan: Trust we will have opportunity to weigh in around assumptions re costs and how that will be addressed.

Recommendation 4: Appropriate new money for the explicit purpose of raising base pay to a competitive level and creating additional leadership opportunities for teachers.

Ryan: 4 things flagged on line represented by 4 bullet points.

Mike: Had raised point that we are asking for a lot of new money, what are taxpayers getting besides a lot of better teachers? What is the return on investment?

Connie: Return is reflected in student achievement.

Isaiah: On line comment: could cover that as we go out and pitch recommendations.

Jason: Return on investment can be expanded in the paragraph portion explanations. May be more added to second paragraph. Say it in the way that is not derogatory to current educators.

Diane: Could phrase it as continuing to move forward in hiring and retaining best teachers.

Connie: Want to recruit, retain highest caliber teachers.

Carl: Important to think about examples from high performing systems, how they went from regular system to high performing in relatively short time.

Jason: Referencing OECD report, reference Finland, Singapore and how central to their effort was raising base pay and making teaching profession attractive to society.

Need more time to vet it.

Consensus: not as specific as Mike, but use paragraph 2 to point out top flight education profession.

Kent: Mike's comments suggest that public see increases as spending tons of money so people can get paid more. Public will need to know what they are getting for their investment.

Jason: Address criticism, some cases teachers receive more money but they have to earn their way into it.

Jessica: Haven't always expected increase in performance when receive increase in pay. Now we will expect real relationship between pay and performance, their work will be evaluated, recognized, appreciated. Will have formal recognition system.

Dan: It will change and improve the system. Shouldn't apologize for teachers being rewarded for doing good work.

Kent: Will compensate teachers for broadening their impact on the district.

Mike: Have heard legislators, general public, see it as red flag. A broader statement than what Ryan has written is needed. Need to write that this will improve performance of system.

Ryan: Expand second paragraph to reinforce the point. Strike class size reference. Improve sentence.

Reference "high performing systems" rather than specifically Finland and Singapore.

Mary Jane: Need to indicate that it has attracted best teachers and enhanced student learning, student achievement.

Ryan rewrites sentence.

Bullet point 2: Do we instead say a percentage? If we say a number, system gets stuck.

Jason: Numbers may have benefit if they are doable.

Connie: It's clear, gives us something to shoot for.

Ryan: Raised this point on Don's behalf.

Jason: Maybe add that State should develop mechanisms and periodically benchmark against other professions.

Carl: Re table, compelling data is percent change.

Ryan: Pulled this table from The Condition of Ed report.

Jason: Point we are making is do people choose other professions due to pay?

Ryan: Page 29, appendix, salary calculations.

Kent: Chart says "average" salaries. Would need to make other adjustments that reflect starting salary. Be careful if you are taking beginning salary off of an average salary table. It would make sense to a lot of lowans.

Denny: Stronger argument for percentage changes.

Mary Jane: Statement about benchmarking covers that point.

Mike: Reference in numbers specific starting salary change, from this number to new number.

Ryan: Move table to appendix, put it next to calculations explanations.

Bullet point 3: 10% increase in salary?

Make sure it aligns with appendix.

Kent: Grand View University went through salary redesign. Did studies and modeling. Looked at promotion amounts, needed to increase so as not to diminish downstream effect.

Jason: Based on other models, we have estimated.

Kent: Need to make that clear.

Connie: Need to make it consistent.

Kent: Step and lane system get layer on top of it?

Mary Jane: Say additional compensation for each one of the roles? Does it make sense for us to arbitrarily pick a number for each district.

Ryan: Suggest estimated or starting point amount. This is a model that districts could adopt..

Denny: Needs some suggestion in there would help eliminate leg work for districts in trying to research what other conferences are doing.

Jessica: Change language to reflect teacher broadening reach and range of influence in classrooms coinciding with pay, rather than ladder idea. Reinforce we are not taking best teachers out of classroom, just broadening their influence and thus increasing their pay.

Mary Jane: Indicate increased responsibilities

Recommendation 5: Establish a Commission on Educator Leadership and Compensation to ensure consistent and successful implementation.

Ryan; Do we need to state various size districts, re teachers and ISEA assured a place on the Commission?

Diane: Add thought about size of districts. Easy to come up with broad range of roles and people, tend to forget about a lot of the state. Hate to see them overlooked.

Jason: Suggests broad geographic and population representations.

Isaiah: Political mandates around commissions? If it is mandated, good idea to have it in there.

Jason; Our intent is to design broad representation.

Recommendation 6:

Collaborate with districts implementing a mechanism for piloting a peer assistance and coaching program.

Ryan: Turns it over to Kent Henning to add additional thoughts about revising and wording

Kent: Some of it gets repetitive.

Ryan: Does this communicate what task force wants to communicate.

Mary Jane: Second paragraph is enough.

Ryan: Reads edits

12:45 – 1:00 p.m. Working Lunch

Recommendation 7: Incentivize teachers to teach in locally and state-defined hard-to-staff subjects and high-need schools.

Ann: Do numbers need commonality?

Jason: Both mechanisms have drawbacks. Local level for implementation – may water things down or misuse things or morph it into other things. Keep all at state level, force everyone to lock step and be vulnerable to state cut backs.

Like local determinations with state guidelines. Phil has talked about using licensure data and establish funds. Bargained in locally more difficult to remove it.

Theresa – this is a good starting point.

Kent: Have you had the time to study what will be the incentive for people to move into certain subject areas or high need schools? Have you examined what really drives the decision?

Connie: Subject? Location? What would the incentive be?

Ryan: What about the language that is already in here as a starting point?

Jason: Is this a state, local, or hybrid driven thing? North Carolina model – highest poverty schools had substantial stipend. Recent data shows it reduced turnover in those schools, increased caliber of teachers there, improved student achievement. Then state cut it.

Linda: Had market based pay here in Iowa once, same thing, it disappeared.

Denny: What is this telling us? There is a cause and effect. Nice to encourage and require schools to do this, but cannot have as many subject requirements as we do.

Mary Jane: Does high need subjects and high needs schools have to look the same? Is subject a tuition credit issue, and high needs a compensation issue. Studies show it's administrator and compensation issue. I don't think they have to look the same.

Ryan: Should we leave this as is with additional statement as starting point, or do we want to get more specific?

Jason: We as a group cannot get that detailed, but as an agency, will have to work through that.

Connie: We are saying that there needs to be incentives.

Ryan: Add sentence clarifying that this is an addition. Other points around market based pay?

Jason: Need to add paragraph that emphasizes that this is not to devalue teachers not in high needs areas, but simply to point out there is a labor market need.

Ryan: Add sentence that purpose is to respond to the labor market.

Jason: Point deserves to stand alone given response it will generate.

Recommendation 8: Build upon existing policy and statute, and provide adequate, sustained funding and implementation support for teacher leadership.

Ryan: Strike sentence altogether, two sentences beginning with finally.

Change to "a way" does not weaken the sentence.

Recommendation 9: Set the boundaries of the system, but allow districts to customize within those boundaries.

Ryan: Two points- 3rd bullet: Do we address what those incentives are?

Ann: Maybe need to diffuse concern about big, broad incentives.

Diane: Around innovation piece

Jason: Competitive grant around innovation?

Diane: Possibly. To let school districts know they can go above and beyond this. They would be recognized beyond a pat on the back.

Jason: Maybe state will provide grant opportunities like competitive grant opportunities for universities and school districts to get teacher prep program off the ground, full year student teaching.

Diane: Would depend on what the district might need. Not innovation if you are being told what to do. It's change but not innovation.

Jason: Saying if there are efforts above and beyond, state will create incentives for innovations. Like TAP program, provides resources for things that would not otherwise be able to be done. Teacher education programs might say we would love to have additional resource for more clinical issues. With money, could smooth out obstacles.

Kent: This document is opportunity to set up competitive grant opportunity.

Ryan: Concerned that this is new idea, as facilitator.

Denny: First step, maybe need to identify who is doing what.

Ryan: That would be the charge of the Commission, ongoing identification of who is doing what well.

Jason: Do we want competitive grants, incentives or not?

Diane: Ultimately, state will need to create creative ways for districts to move beyond this plan.

Jason: State will provide grant opportunities for innovation for teacher leadership, preparation, and Iowa education career pathways.

Ann: What is the measure of the greater innovation?

Connie: Add that measures will be established by the Commission?

Jason: (Reads new edits for those over the phone)

Ryan: Second bullet at district level:

Ann: Take that piece out, unless specific incentive not restricting numbers.

Kent: Aren't we getting in to implementing with integrity? Is this sufficiently covered with establishing commission?

Mary Jane: Initially came up re establishing quotas.

Denny: If you don't make things clear from the beginning, like Phase III money, then come in and do an autopsy on choices, implementation?

Mary Jane: What is the state structure? We have not said that this is the structure that all must follow, but that districts could follow.

Jason: Back to tight/loose dilemma. We are tight on what teacher roles do, loose on how they are used.

Mary Jane: We have defined what each one does with duties and responsibilities. Uncomfortable that later we are saying this is a mandate. What is the basic structure to which all Iowa districts will adhere?

Jason: State structure is initial career model, mentor, leader that local districts will adhere and adopt to it. Districts can differentiate how they are using these different roles and configurations.

Diane: Already states that structure is to be implemented with integrity.

Mary Jane: Not giving them option on structure. Seems that we are moving to being much more prescriptive in their structures and how they go about implementing this.

Phone: Concern is based on saying this is a model instead of structure?

Jason: Are you advocating for a variety of ways for career pathways to be done?

Kent: Turned to senate file 2284. It makes it clear as to what is mandated. That has been my understanding all along working on this task force.

Mary Jane: I think our language is unclear. Think it is contradictory to say this is a model that districts may adopt, if we are going to mandate structure.

Phone: Need to be careful as to where we allow too much interpretation, flexibility.

Diane: A matter of aligning words, semantics?

Jason: My understanding is that if we say this is the structure that district has to create a pathway to model teacher, etc.

Diane: Intent was to have district develop teacher leader, encourage teachers. Communication that districts would expect teachers to have teacher leadership roles.

Isaiah: Summarize debate.

Ryan: Too restrictive, or right to say this is the structure and we have been sufficiently clear about what needs to be adhered to or not. We did reach consensus previously.

Mary Jane: We had consensus on the others, now this is conflicting

Ryan: Do you have a language suggestion for resolving the language conflict?

Jason: Yes, we are saying this is a structure that districts must adhere to. Tight/loose dilemma. I see structural model, where it's tight is the teacher roles. Compensation aligned with that – can have step and lane, another system that does away with step and lane, lanes for advanced degrees or not. Local level decisions can be how many master, lead, teachers, subject areas specific? Thousand ways to configure model. Tight on structure, loose on configuration as to what it looks like in each districts.

Phone: Element of concern? Career path at all or how tightly it is defined? Language of path or funding?

Jason: What is the level of prescription from the state?

Mary Jane: I'm hearing that this is the only way this will look in all districts in Iowa. We have taken away from local districts a lot of ability for them to do what they need to do.

Phone: Does it have to be each district, or county wide, districts shared?

Jason: Some concern if you don't have level of prescription. Rather have state say here are the roles, if you already have people in these roles, you need to compensate them.

Phone: Right now, burden placed on teachers that are born leaders. If we don't have guidelines, will have what we have now.

Mary Jane: Concerns with what we are not leaving to local level.

Denny: In past, DE has come up with models that say if you have something else that meets model criteria. Not so tightly prescribed, but not so loose that there are no guidelines. Need juried way to look at it.

Jason: Change language to say districts would adopt this model or some conforming model.

Mary Jane: Recommendation 1, page 11. Paragraph above graphic. Amend language.

Jason: suggests edits and add another sentence, with word "may" develop alternative models that align with principles in model described here.

Denny: Implicit that commission has to make some value laden decision.

Jason: Gives examples pertaining to accreditation issues. As long as components are met. Commission would facilitate that.

Ryan: Mary Jane's point is to align language within document.

Ryan suggests we continue. Continue working then put document out to all on line for check. Group agrees.

Recommendation 10: Provide time for local planning and implementation inclusive of teachers as a part of the decision-making process.

Fine as is.

Recommendation 11: Require districts to implement professional development structures that allow for continuous, embedded teacher collaboration around student growth and are aligned with the Iowa Professional Development Model.

Ryan: Dan wanted to make sure that people understand this is not new idea.

Theresa: Issue is that it's just giving lip service. IPDM not just for those doing CSIP. Won't improve pedagogy unless you have professional development.

Ryan: Strike paragraph top page 23?

Theresa: Adjust paragraph end, need to reemphasize that IPDM is here and we need to use it.

Denny: Good to have that refresher in there.

Ryan: Rest becomes somewhat redundant. Then don't have to get into job embedded professional development. Drop embedded to eliminate confusion. Leaves one paragraph in body. This would also address all those comments Phil had. 11 was fist to five electronically. Will ask for another fist to five due to significant reduction in size.

Recommendation 12: Coordinate the development of teacher leadership pathways with the ongoing role of teacher preparation programs.

Fine as is.

Recommendation 13: Create a Residency Year for entry into the teaching profession to build a more seamless transition from teacher preparation to practice/employment.

Ryan: Discussed extensively previously, seeking additional comments now.

Connie: Should we say initial, residency? Keep it consistent.

Jason: Clarify language. Residency is first year full time teaching of initial teacher.

Ryan: Discuss conclusion, appendix, and go back to introduction briefly.

Do bullet points still reflect what we believe now at the end of the process? We will leave it if Mike has additional thoughts he can weigh in.

Appendix: I will in model draft make sure it aligns with minimum of 10% with state board certification.

Jason: Make sure page 31 aligns with roles and responsibilities we had earlier.

Connie: Placement doesn't seem quite right. Maybe call it the "Iowa" career.

Introduction and Overview

Introduction: Jason had suggested that this language be embraced by entire task force. Connie suggests talking about student achievement regarding what public gets for their investment.

Mary Jane: "Unanimous" sounds like we had 5's on fist to fives every time. Take out "unanimously".

Jason: Last paragraph – maybe reworking that sentence to include student achievement.

Connie: Need to mention student achievement related to what public receives for its investment. Need to light a fire under it.

Mike: Concerns with lead sentence. If idea is to wake up people to sense of urgency, it doesn't do it.

Denny: Conversation with who the audience is. First audience is teachers.

Ryan: Question is about first line of introduction. Teachers or legislators audience?

Theresa: Likes the way it starts out.

Isaiah: Don't want to get to the point where they read the first sentence and say why do we need the rest of this.

Ryan: Last point, overview, loose, tight – not much additional comment or feedback.

Ryan: Next step, Monday, will send 2 versions, one shows track changes, one clean for easy reading. Two day window for final comment and sign off. Officially out on October 15th. You will receive final copy in advance of that.